

1 MICHAEL M. MADDIGAN (SBN 163450)  
2 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
3 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
4 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
5 Telephone: (310) 785-4727  
6 Facsimile: (310) 785-4601  
7 Email: michael.maddigan@hoganlovells.com

8 Attorney for *M.M.M.* Plaintiffs  
9  
10  
11

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN DIEGO DIVISION

M.M.M., on behalf of his minor child,  
J.M.A., et al.,

Case No. 3:18-cv-1832-DMS

Honorable Dana M. Sabraw

Plaintiffs,

v.

Jefferson Beauregard Sessions, III,  
Attorney General of the United States,  
et al.,

Defendant.

Ms. L, et al.,

Case No. 3:18-cv-428-DMS

Honorable Dana M. Sabraw

Plaintiff,

v.

U.S. Immigration and Customs  
Enforcement, et al.,

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF  
EMERGENCY MOTION AND  
MOTION TO REQUIRE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF  
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

Defendant.

1                   **TO ALL DEFENDANTS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2                   **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT**, Plaintiffs in the above-caption cases  
3 will, and hereby do, seek relief from the Court through an emergency motion, to be  
4 heard and decided by the Court at the earliest time convenient for the Court.

5                   Through this emergency motion, Plaintiffs seek to enforce the government's  
6 promises and commitments to this Court without waiting for final approval of the  
7 settlement agreement in this matter. The government now is reneging on those  
8 promises and commitments, and, in doing so, is causing severe prejudice to  
9 Plaintiffs that should be remedied immediately.

10                  Given Defendants' prior representations on this issue, and the harm that  
11 further delay will cause to detained class members, Plaintiffs respectfully ask the  
12 Court to order the government to proceed with implementing the parties' settlement  
13 agreement and order any other relief the Court deems appropriate.

14                  Plaintiffs' motion will be based upon this notice of motion and motion, the  
15 attached memorandum of points and authorities, and all the Court's files and  
16 records in this action.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1                   October 10, 2018

**HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP**

2                   /s/ Michael Maddigan \_\_\_\_\_

3                   Michael Maddigan  
4                   (Cal. Bar No. 163450)  
5                   1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
6                   Los Angeles, CA 90067  
7                   Telephone: (310) 785-4727  
8                   Facsimile: (310) 785-4601  
9                   michael.maddigan@hoganlovells.com

10                  Justin W. Bernick\*

11                  Zachary W. Best\*

12                  T. Clark Weymouth\*

13                  555 Thirteenth Street, NW

14                  Washington, DC 20004

15                  Telephone: (202) 637-5600

16                  Facsimile: (202) 637-5910

17                  justin.bernick@hoganlovells.com

18                  t.weymouth@hoganlovells.com

19                  zachary.best@hoganlovells.com

20                  Oliver J. Armas\*

21                  Ira M. Feinberg (Cal. Bar No. 064066)

22                  875 Third Avenue

23                  New York, NY 10022

24                  Telephone: (212) 918-3000

25                  Facsimile: (212) 918-3100

26                  oliver.armas@hoganlovells.com

27                  ira.feinberg@hoganlovells.com

28                  Katherine A. Nelson\*

29                  1601 Wewatta Street, Suite 900

30                  Denver, CO 80202

31                  Telephone: (303) 899-7300

32                  Facsimile: (303) 899-7333

33                  katherine.nelson@hoganlovells.com

34                  Haley K. Costello Essig\*

35                  Park Place II, Ninth Floor

36                  7930 Jones Branch Drive

37                  McLean, VA 22102-3302

38                  Telephone: (703) 610-6100

39                  Facsimile: (703) 610-6200

40                  haley.essig@hoganlovells.com

41                  \*Admitted *pro hac vice*

42                  *Class Counsel for Child Class*

43                  Aaron M. Olsen

44                  Haeggquist and Eck LLP

45                  225 Broadway, Ste 2050

46                  San Diego, CA 92101

47                  phone: 619.342.8000

48                  - 3 -                   PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF EMERGENCY  
49                  MOTION AND MOTION TO REQUIRE  
50                  IMPLEMENTATION OF SETTLEMENT

1 fax: 619.342.7878  
2 aarono@haelaw.com

3 Wilson G. Barmeyer\*\*  
4 EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND (US)  
5 LLP  
6 700 Sixth Street NW, Suite 700  
7 Washington, DC 20001  
8 (202) 383-0100  
9 (202) 637-3593 (facsimile)  
10 wilsonbarmeyer@eversheds-  
11 sutherland.com

12 John H. Fleming\*\*  
13 EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND (US)  
14 LLP  
15 999 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 2300  
16 Atlanta, GA 30309  
17 (404) 853-8000  
18 (404) 853-8806 (facsimile)  
19 johnfleming@eversheds-sutherland.com

20 Sirine Shebaya\*\*  
21 Johnathan Smith\*\*  
22 MUSLIM ADVOCATES  
23 P.O. Box 34440  
24 Washington, D.C. 20043  
25 (202) 897-2622  
26 (202) 508-1007 (facsimile)  
27 sirine@muslimadvocates.org  
28 johnathan@muslimadvocates.org

29 Simon Y. Sandoval-Moshenberg\*\*  
30 Sophia Gregg\*\*  
31 LEGAL AID JUSTICE CENTER  
32 6066 Leesburg Pike, Suite 520  
33 Falls Church, VA 22041  
34 (703) 778-3450  
35 (703) 778-3454 (facsimile)  
36 simon@justice4all.org  
37 sophia@justice4all.org

38 \*\* *Pro hac vice* admission applications  
39 forthcoming

40 *Class Counsel for Parent Class*

41 Lee Gelernt  
42 Judy Rabinovitz  
43 Anand Balakrishnan  
44 Stephen Kang  
45 Spencer Amdur  
46 Daniel Galindo  
47 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
48 UNION FOUNDATION

1 125 Broad St.  
2 18th Floor  
3 New York, NY 10004  
4 T: (212) 549-2660  
5 F: (212) 549-2654  
6 lgelernt@aclu.org  
7 jrabinovitz@aclu.org  
8 abalakrishnan@aclu.org  
9 skang@aclu.org  
10 samdur@aclu.org  
11 dgalindo@aclu.org

12 *Class Counsel For Removed Parents*

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I filed the foregoing NOTICE OF MOTION AND  
EMERGENCY MOTION TO REQUIRE IMPLEMENTATION OF  
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, with the Clerk of the Court through the ECF  
system on October 10, 2018. This system provided a copy to and effected service  
of this document on all parties.

Dated: October 10, 2018

HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP

By: /s/ Michael Maddigan  
Michael Maddigan  
Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 MICHAEL M. MADDIGAN (SBN 163450)  
2 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
3 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
4 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
5 Telephone: (310) 785-4727  
6 Facsimile: (310) 785-4601  
7 Email: michael.maddigan@hoganlovells.com

8 Attorney for *M.M.M.* Plaintiffs

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**SAN DIEGO DIVISION**

M.M.M., on behalf of his minor child,  
J.M.A., et al.,

Case No. 3:18-cv-1832-DMS

Honorable Dana M. Sabraw

Plaintiffs,

v.

Jefferson Beauregard Sessions, III,  
Attorney General of the United States,  
et al.,

Defendant.

Ms. L, et al.,

Case No. 3:18-cv-428-DMS

Honorable Dana M. Sabraw

Plaintiff,

v.

U.S. Immigration and Customs  
Enforcement, et al.,

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS  
AND AUTHORITIES IN  
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'  
EMERGENCY MOTION TO  
REQUIRE IMPLEMENTATION  
OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

Defendant.

1       Plaintiffs file this emergency motion in light of a disturbing development on  
 2 the heels of the Court's preliminary approval of the parties' settlement agreement.  
 3 In short, the government indicated today that it intends to go back on its  
 4 commitment – made to both Plaintiffs and this Court – to implement the settlement  
 5 agreement prior to final approval for families who wish to avail themselves of the  
 6 agreed-to procedures. Further delay is unacceptable for families that have already  
 7 been in detention for months and are eager to go through procedures the  
 8 government agreed to in the settlement.

9       During a status conference on September 14, 2018, in response to pointed  
 10 questions from the Court, counsel for Defendants represented that the government  
 11 would "get moving" and begin implementing the agreement without waiting for  
 12 final approval:

13       **THE COURT:** Okay. And then what about the idea of starting now.  
 14 It seems to me that the vast majority of *Ms. L.* class members and  
 15 *MMM* class members, once the class is certified, are going to be  
 onboard and ready to proceed. *Is it possible to start right away?*

16       The idea of class certification and final approval of the  
 17 settlement and a notice and opportunity to object really, I think, will  
 18 apply to a very small handful of potential class members, if any. *And*  
*it seems to me that the process could get underway sooner rather than*  
*later, and not have to wait for final approval. What would the*  
*government's view be?*

19       **MR. STEWART:** Your honor, our tentative view would be that *I*  
*think that that is appropriate and we could get moving on this.*

20       I would just say if I do come – if it does come to my attention,  
 21 you know, an impediment or sort of a reason otherwise, may we bring  
 that to the court's attention if we realize it?

22       But my hope is with most – you know, as with other plans we  
 23 have approved it consistent with our desire to move things  
 expeditiously but orderly, *we would want to just get moving. If it is a*  
*good plan, we should get moving.*

24       Ex. 15 at 9-10 (emphasis added). The Court then stated that "the parties ought to  
 25 get moving," and that "to the extent you can identify plaintiffs – children and  
 26 parents – who want to get started with the various proceedings under 235 or 240,  
 27 *that we ought to start that right away . . . and then get the process going.*" *Id.* at 10  
 28 (emphasis added). The Court also indicated that it wanted the parties to "give a

1 status as to the various proceedings under 235, 240, whatever they might be under  
 2 the proposed settlement, so that the Court and the public can keep track of the  
 3 parties' efforts and progress with respect to these asylum claims." *Id.* at 11; *see*  
 4 *also id.* at 14 (Court inquiring about timeline of implementation based on  
 5 assumption that "[w]e get started right now" and "235, 240 hearings and all of the  
 6 things that are contemplated in the proposed settlement are moving efficiently and  
 7 from the earliest possible date"). Thus, the Court (and Plaintiffs) clearly believed  
 8 that class members would be able to pursue the processes described in the  
 9 agreement before any final approval order.

10 The government never brought any concerns about this commitment to the  
 11 Court's attention. In fact, it *reiterated* its commitment in an e-mail to Plaintiffs on  
 12 September 20, 2018. That e-mail stated that "[t]he government is undertaking to  
 13 implement the parties' agreement in accordance with the court's tentative approval  
 14 at the last status conference." Ex. 16. Defendants' counsel also stated: "As the  
 15 government identifies individuals to be processed under the different provisions of  
 16 the agreement, and starts to move those processes forward, it is important that we  
 17 know ASAP . . . which parents and children wish to pursue the processes set forth  
 18 in the agreement, so that there is likewise no unneeded delay in enabling those class  
 19 members to move forward." *Id.* Plaintiffs have relied upon this representation over  
 20 the last several weeks, as described in more detail below.

21 Now, the government has done an about-face. By e-mail today, Defendants'  
 22 counsel stated that the government will *not* move forward with implementing the  
 23 settlement other than to accept class members' executed notice and waiver forms.  
 24 Defendants' counsel refused to confirm that it would comply with the schedule in  
 25 Paragraph 1(g) of the agreement and move forward with the interviews  
 26 contemplated in the settlement. Thus, the government is not moving forward with  
 27 interviews for any class members, including the more than 60 detained parents and  
 28 children Plaintiffs have identified so far as wanting to stay in the United States and

1 invoke the settlement procedures. All of these parents have signed the court-  
 2 approved notice and waiver form, and their names and executed forms have been  
 3 provided to the government. Per the Court's instruction, the parties should "get the  
 4 process going" for these families by providing the agreed-to interviews and  
 5 reporting on the results.

6 There is no reason for delay at this point, and every reason to move forward  
 7 expeditiously. The Court issued a temporary restraining order *M.M.M.* because it  
 8 found that Plaintiffs were likely to succeed on their claim that they have a right to  
 9 certain asylum procedures prior to removal – procedures which the government  
 10 agreed to in the settlement. The Court has described the settlement agreement as  
 11 "excellent" and granted preliminary approval without reservation just yesterday.  
 12 As described above, the Court has also emphasized that parents and children should  
 13 receive the procedures outlined in the agreement prior to final approval. Most  
 14 importantly, these families should have received due process when they first  
 15 crossed the border together *months* ago. Instead, they suffered intense trauma due  
 16 to the government's illegal separation policy, and they are now suffering through  
 17 months of prolonged, unnecessary detention. Delay will only further the harm the  
 18 government has already inflicted on these families. Their asylum claims should be  
 19 heard according to the agreed-to procedures now, not six or more weeks from now.

20 The government stated today that implementing the settlement prior to final  
 21 approval will cause it to incur the burdens of the settlement without any of the  
 22 benefits. Not so. Any class member who elects to receive the procedures described  
 23 in the agreement will be bound by the terms of the agreement – including the  
 24 release. Moreover, every day that the government delays implementation of the  
 25 agreement is a day that parents and children decide enough is enough, and choose  
 26 to accept removal rather than wait in detention for their asylum claims to be heard.  
 27 Indeed, just last week Plaintiffs notified the government that over 40 detained  
 28 families decided to accept removal – instead of receive due process – because they

1 simply could not wait in detention any longer. While that kind of result may be  
 2 optimal from the government's perspective, it defeats the purpose of this case, the  
 3 parties' settlement, and this Court's order granting a temporary restraining order. It  
 4 is completely at odds with this Court's desire for a solution that swiftly resolves  
 5 Plaintiffs' claims.

6 The government's reversal is made worse by the fact that it prejudices  
 7 Plaintiffs, who relied on it in multiple ways over the least several weeks. For  
 8 example, Plaintiffs patiently tolerated the government's unnecessary delay of the  
 9 preliminary approval process. Plaintiffs first sent the government draft preliminary  
 10 approval papers less than a week after the September 14 status conference, on  
 11 September 19. The government then insisted on multiple rounds of minor line edits  
 12 to those papers, including a number of edits in the second and third rounds that it  
 13 could have made in the rounds prior. Due to this delay, Plaintiffs could not file the  
 14 motion for preliminary approval until October 5 (over two weeks after Plaintiffs  
 15 sent the first draft to the government), and had to push back the proposed date of  
 16 the fairness hearing to November 15. The only reason Plaintiffs tolerated this delay  
 17 is because of the government's representation that it would implement the  
 18 settlement agreement prior to final approval. Plaintiffs also would have proposed a  
 19 more aggressive notice plan and schedule for final approval had the government not  
 20 committed to begin implementation immediately. Finally, the families who already  
 21 signed the notice and waiver form did so based on the reasonable belief that their  
 22 interviews would proceed expeditiously – not several weeks from now.

23 Given Defendants' prior representations on this issue, the Court's express  
 24 desire move this process along with alacrity, and the harm that further delay will  
 25 cause to detained class members, Plaintiffs respectfully ask the Court to order the  
 26 government to proceed with implementing the parties' settlement agreement and  
 27 order any other relief the Court deems appropriate.

28

1                   October 10, 2018

**HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP**

2                   /s/ Michael Maddigan

3                   Michael Maddigan  
4                   (Cal. Bar No. 163450)  
5                   1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
6                   Los Angeles, CA 90067  
7                   Telephone: (310) 785-4727  
8                   Facsimile: (310) 785-4601  
9                   michael.maddigan@hoganlovells.com

10                  Justin W. Bernick\*

11                  Zachary W. Best\*

12                  T. Clark Weymouth\*

13                  555 Thirteenth Street, NW

14                  Washington, DC 20004

15                  Telephone: (202) 637-5600

16                  Facsimile: (202) 637-5910

17                  justin.bernick@hoganlovells.com

18                  t.weymouth@hoganlovells.com

19                  zachary.best@hoganlovells.com

20                  Oliver J. Armas\*

21                  Ira M. Feinberg (Cal. Bar No. 064066)

22                  875 Third Avenue

23                  New York, NY 10022

24                  Telephone: (212) 918-3000

25                  Facsimile: (212) 918-3100

26                  oliver.armas@hoganlovells.com

27                  ira.feinberg@hoganlovells.com

28                  Katherine A. Nelson\*

29                  1601 Wewatta Street, Suite 900

30                  Denver, CO 80202

31                  Telephone: (303) 899-7300

32                  Facsimile: (303) 899-7333

33                  katherine.nelson@hoganlovells.com

34                  Haley K. Costello Essig\*

35                  Park Place II, Ninth Floor

36                  7930 Jones Branch Drive

37                  McLean, VA 22102-3302

38                  Telephone: (703) 610-6100

39                  Facsimile: (703) 610-6200

40                  haley.essig@hoganlovells.com

41                  \*Admitted *pro hac vice*

42                  *Class Counsel for Child Class*

43                  Aaron M. Olsen

44                  Haeggquist and Eck LLP

45                  225 Broadway, Ste 2050

46                  San Diego, CA 92101

47                  phone: 619.342.8000

48                  MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND

49                  AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF

50                  PLAINTIFFS' EMERGENCY MOTION

1 fax: 619.342.7878  
2 aarono@haelaw.com

3 Wilson G. Barmeyer\*\*  
4 EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND (US)  
5 LLP  
6 700 Sixth Street NW, Suite 700  
7 Washington, DC 20001  
8 (202) 383-0100  
9 (202) 637-3593 (facsimile)  
10 wilsonbarmeyer@eversheds-  
11 sutherland.com

12 John H. Fleming\*\*  
13 EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND (US)  
14 LLP  
15 999 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 2300  
16 Atlanta, GA 30309  
17 (404) 853-8000  
18 (404) 853-8806 (facsimile)  
19 johnfleming@eversheds-sutherland.com

20 Sirine Shebaya\*\*  
21 Johnathan Smith\*\*  
22 MUSLIM ADVOCATES  
23 P.O. Box 34440  
24 Washington, D.C. 20043  
25 (202) 897-2622  
26 (202) 508-1007 (facsimile)  
27 sirine@muslimadvocates.org  
28 johnathan@muslimadvocates.org

29 Simon Y. Sandoval-Moshenberg\*\*  
30 Sophia Gregg\*\*  
31 LEGAL AID JUSTICE CENTER  
32 6066 Leesburg Pike, Suite 520  
33 Falls Church, VA 22041  
34 (703) 778-3450  
35 (703) 778-3454 (facsimile)  
36 simon@justice4all.org  
37 sophia@justice4all.org

38 \*\* *Pro hac vice* admission applications  
39 forthcoming

40 *Class Counsel for Parent Class*

41 Lee Gelernt  
42 Judy Rabinovitz  
43 Anand Balakrishnan  
44 Stephen Kang  
45 Spencer Amdur  
46 Daniel Galindo  
47 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
48 UNION FOUNDATION

49 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
50 AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF  
51 PLAINTIFFS' EMERGENCY MOTION

1 125 Broad St.  
2 18th Floor  
3 New York, NY 10004  
4 T: (212) 549-2660  
5 F: (212) 549-2654  
6 lgelernt@aclu.org  
7 jrabinovitz@aclu.org  
8 abalakrishnan@aclu.org  
9 skang@aclu.org  
10 samdur@aclu.org  
11 dgalindo@aclu.org

12 *Class Counsel For Removed Parents*

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I filed the foregoing MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' EMERGENCY MOTION TO REQUIRE IMPLEMENTATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, with the Clerk of the Court through the ECF system on October 10, 2018. This system provided a copy to and effected service of this document on all parties.

Dated: October 10, 2018

HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP

By: /s/ Michael Maddigan  
Michael Maddigan  
Attorneys for Plaintiff

*M.M.M., on behalf of his minor child, J.M.A., et al. v. Jefferson Beauregard Sessions, III, Attorney General of the United States, et al.*

**EXHIBITS TO PLAINTIFFS' EMERGENCY MOTION TO REQUIRE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Exhibit	Document	Pages
15	Transcript of September 14, 2018 Status Conference in <i>Ms. L v. ICE</i>	11-25
16	September 20, 2018 E-mail from S. Stewart to J. Bernick	26-27

## EXHIBIT 15

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE HONORABLE DANA M. SABRAW, JUDGE PRESIDING

---

MS. L, ET AL., )  
PETITIONERS-PLAINTIFFS, ) CASE NO. 18CV0428-DMS  
VS. ) 18CV1626-DMS  
U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ) 18CV1832-DMS  
ENFORCEMENT ("ICE"), ET AL., ) SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA  
RESPONDENTS-DEFENDANTS. ) SEPTEMBER 14, 2018  
1:00 P.M. CALENDAR

---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TELEPHONIC STATUS CONFERENCE

REPORTED BY:

LEE ANN PENCE,  
OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER  
UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE  
333 WEST BROADWAY, ROOM 1393  
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

COUNSEL APPEARING TELEPHONICALLY:

FOR PLAINTIFF:

LEE GELERNT, ESQ.  
ACLU IMMIGRANT RIGHTS PROJECT  
125 BROAD STREET 18TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10004

FOR DEFENDANT:

SCOTT STEWART, ESQ.  
SARAH B. FABIAN, ESQ.  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION  
P.O. BOX 868  
BEN FRANKLIN STATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20044

ALSO APPEARING:

ZACHARY BEST, ESQ.  
JUSTIN W. BERNICK, ESQ.  
JEFFIFER LEVY, ESQ.  
CAROLINE HELLER, ESQ.  
JACK MCBRIDE, ESQ.  
SIRINE SHEBAYA, ESQ.  
WILSON BARMEYER, ESQ.  
REX CHEN, ESQ.  
ADAM SIEGLER, ESQ.  
GUILLERMO STAMPUR, ESQ.

1 **SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA - FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2018 - 2:17 P.M.**

2 \* \* \*

3 **THE CLERK:** NO. 23 ON CALENDAR, CASE NO. 18CV0428,  
4 MS. L. VERSUS U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT; ON FOR  
5 STATUS CONFERENCE.

6 **THE COURT:** GOOD AFTERNOON. THIS IS JUDGE SABRAW.  
7 I HAVE A NUMBER OF APPEARANCES THAT MY COURTROOM DEPUTY GAVE  
8 ME. LET ME READ THE NAMES FOR WHO I HAVE ON THE LINE.

9 FOR THE GOVERNMENT, FOR DEFENDANTS, I HAVE  
10 MS. FABIAN, MR. STEWART. FOR MS. L. PLAINTIFFS MR. GELERNTH.  
11 NTC PLAINTIFFS MS. LEVY. MMM, MR. BEST AND MR. BERNICK. FOR  
12 THE RGH, ONE OF THE NEW YORK CASES, MS HELLER, MR. REX CHEN.  
13 ON THE DORA CASE THERE ARE APPEARANCES FROM MS. SHEBAYA AND  
14 MR. BARMEYER.

15 THEN I ALSO HAVE THE FOLLOWING NAMES: MR. ADAM  
16 SIEGLER, MS. CAROLINE HELLER, MR. JACK MCBRIDE, AND  
17 MR. GUILLERMO, I THINK, STAMPUR.

18 HAVE I MISSED ANYONE? OKAY. HEARING NO PROTESTS WE  
19 WILL ASSUME, WITH THAT, LINEUP OF COUNSEL.

20 THEN LET'S GO AHEAD AND GET RIGHT INTO THE ISSUES.

21 LET'S START FIRST WITH THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT  
22 INVOLVING MMM, MS. L., AND THE DORA PLAINTIFFS, ALL OF THOSE  
23 INDIVIDUALS. AND PERHAPS I CAN START ON A PROCEDURAL LEVEL  
24 FIRST.

25 I RECEIVED A LETTER FROM MS. WEISS AND MS. GLYNN ON

SEPTEMBER 14, 2018

1 BEHALF OF THE CATHOLIC CHARITIES COMMUNITY SERVICES, THE  
 2 ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK, FOR CERTAIN OF THE CHILDREN WHO MAY  
 3 FALL WITHIN THE MMM CLASS.

4 THEY ARE INDICATING THAT ANY SETTLEMENT WOULD FIRST  
 5 HAVE TO INVOLVE CLASS CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL PURSUANT TO  
 6 RULE 23.

7 THAT SEEMS CORRECT TO ME. SO I GUESS THAT WOULD BE  
 8 THE FIRST QUESTION IS, THIS SETTLEMENT WOULD HAVE TO GO  
 9 THROUGH A PROPOSED CLASS CERTIFICATION AND SETTLEMENT, AM I  
 10 CORRECT? AND THAT WOULD THEN PROVIDE --

11 **MR. BERNICK:** YOUR HONOR, THIS IS JUSTIN BERNICK,  
 12 COUNSEL FOR MMM. AND I BELIEVE I CAN SPEAK FOR THE MS. L.  
 13 PLAINTIFFS AND DORA PLAINTIFFS AND MMM PLAINTIFFS ON THIS  
 14 ISSUE, BUT THEY SHOULD CHIME IN IF THEY HAVE OTHER THOUGHTS.

15 YOUR HONOR, WE DO BELIEVE THAT RULE 23(E) IMPOSES  
 16 OBLIGATIONS WHEN A CLASS -- WHEN A CASE IS BEING SETTLED ON A  
 17 CLASS-WIDE BASIS, AND OUR GOAL WOULD BE TO ADDRESS THE ISSUES  
 18 UNDER RULE 23(E) AS QUICKLY AND EFFICIENTLY AS WE POSSIBLY  
 19 COULD. AND WE CERTAINLY LOOK TO YOUR HONOR FOR GUIDANCE ON  
 20 HOW BEST TO ADDRESS THOSE ISSUES.

21 WE HAD -- SEPARATELY WE HAVE BEEN SPEAKING WITH  
 22 NUMEROUS ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS, AS YOU MIGHT EXPECT,  
 23 INCLUDING MS. CATHERINE WEISS WHO SUBMITTED THIS LETTER, AND  
 24 WE HAVE ALSO BEEN COMMUNICATING SINCE THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT  
 25 WAS FILED WITH OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES, AND TRYING TO MAKE

SEPTEMBER 14, 2018

1 SURE THAT EVERYONE KNOWS ABOUT THE PLAN AND WHAT THE RIGHTS  
2 AND OBLIGATIONS ARE UNDER THE AGREEMENT. BUT WE DO BELIEVE  
3 THAT WE NEED TO MAKE SURE THAT WE COMPLY WITH RULE 23(E) AND  
4 COME UP WITH A PLAN FOR DOING SO.

5 ON THIS CALL, YOUR HONOR, I DON'T BELIEVE THAT THE  
6 MS. L. PLAINTIFFS, DORA PLAINTIFFS, OR MMM PLAINTIFFS HAVE A  
7 CERTAIN IDEA AS TO WHAT THAT PLAN SHOULD BE. WE ARE HAPPY,  
8 THOUGH, YOUR HONOR, TO MEET AND CONFER WITH THE GOVERNMENT  
9 ABOUT THAT PLAN AND COME FORWARD WITH A PROPOSAL.

10 FRANKLY, YOUR HONOR, OUR FOCUS HAS BEEN ON -- AS YOU  
11 CAN SEE IT IS A DETAILED PLAN, TRYING TO MAKE SURE THAT WE  
12 COULD REACH AGREEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT ON WHAT THE  
13 PROCEDURES SHOULD BE AND COME UP WITH A SETTLEMENT THAT  
14 ADEQUATELY PROTECTED THE INTERESTS OF THE CLASS, AND HAD BEEN  
15 LESS SO ON THE PROCEDURAL ISSUES. BUT WE DO BELIEVE THEY  
16 SHOULD BE ADDRESSED.

17 **THE COURT:** YES.

18 MR. STEWART, I ASSUME YOU AGREE.

19 **MR. STEWART:** YES, YOUR HONOR. I THINK THE  
20 APPROPRIATE APPROACH IS FOR YOUR HONOR TO ENTER AN ORDER  
21 AFFIRMING THAT THE RULE 23, YOU KNOW, ACCEPTING THE, YOU KNOW,  
22 THE STIPULATED CLASS AND JUST CONFIRMING THAT THE RULE 23  
23 CRITERIA ARE SATISFIED JUST TO MAKE CLEAR THAT THIS IS A  
24 BINDING SETTLEMENT AND IT RESOLVES THE RIGHTS AND CLAIMS AS  
25 STATED IN THE AGREEMENT.

SEPTEMBER 14, 2018

Exhibit 15,

Page 16

1                   THE POINT I MIGHT EMPHASIZE, YOUR HONOR -- AND I  
2 THINK MR. BERNICK DID WELL TO HIT THIS POINT.

3                   I JUST WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT I THINK WE HAVE BEEN  
4 VERY CAREFUL, I THINK, THROUGHOUT THIS PROCESS TO MAKE  
5 SURE BOTH SIDES -- YOU KNOW, MR. BERNICK INDICATED A LOT OF  
6 CONTACT WITH STAKEHOLDERS ON THE PLAINTIFFS' SIDE AND JUST A  
7 LOT OF WORK TO MAKE SURE ALL DIFFERENT INTERESTS WERE  
8 ACCOUNTED FOR FOR THE FOLKS COVERED BY THE SETTLEMENT  
9 AGREEMENT.

10                  SO GIVEN ALL OF THAT AND THE AMOUNT OF EFFORT AND  
11 COMPREHENSIVENESS OF THIS AGREEMENT, YOUR HONOR, I WOULD  
12 EMPHASIZE AND AGREE THAT THE RULE 23 ISSUES AND THOSE  
13 PROCEDURAL MATTERS CAN BE RESOLVED QUITE EXPEDITIOUSLY AND  
14 NEEDN'T -- AND WOULD CALL FOR JUST VERY, VERY MINIMAL, YOU  
15 KNOW, FURTHER WORK TO GET APPROVAL SO THAT WE CAN ALL MOVE  
16 FORWARD WITH THIS PLAN AND GET THINGS ON THE ROAD.

17                  SO I WOULD EMPHASIZE EXPEDITIOUSNESS, AND I THINK WE  
18 ARE VERY CLOSE ON, REALLY, ALL POINTS.

19                  **THE COURT:** I AGREE WITH THAT. I THINK MOVING AS  
20 QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE IN AN ORDERLY FASHION IS THE WAY TO GO,  
21 WITH, OF COURSE, THE OPPORTUNITY FOR ANY POTENTIAL CLASS  
22 MEMBER TO OBJECT AND TO BE HEARD UNDER RULE 23.

23                  BUT IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE -- WHAT I WOULD PROPOSE  
24 IS THAT IT MAY BE PRUDENT FOR COUNSEL TO MEET AND CONFER AND  
25 SUBMIT TO THE COURT A JOINT MOTION AND ORDER ADDRESSING THE

SEPTEMBER 14, 2018

1 RULE 23 ISSUES. SO I THINK WHAT THAT WOULD ENCOMPASS IS A  
2 PROPOSED CLASS CERTIFICATION AND ESSENTIALLY APPROVAL OF THE  
3 SETTLEMENT SUBJECT TO AN OPPORTUNITY FOR ANYONE TO OBJECT AND  
4 TO BE HEARD.

5 DO YOU AGREE?

6 **MR. STEWART:** THE GOVERNMENT THINKS THAT THAT IS AN  
7 APPROPRIATE APPROACH, YOUR HONOR. AND I WOULD I THINK WE  
8 SHOULD DO THAT EXPEDITIOUSLY. AND THAT IT SOUNDS LIKE YOUR  
9 HONOR IS ENVISIONING SOMETHING BRIEF BUT JUST COVERS THOSE KEY  
10 ISSUES, THE RULE 23 ISSUES, AND APPROVAL, PROPOSED CLASS  
11 CERTIFIED, AND NOT SOMETHING VERY ELABORATE OR LENGTHY, JUST  
12 SOMETHING SUFFICIENT.

13 **THE COURT:** YES. I THINK WHAT'S IMPORTANT IS THE  
14 DUE PROCESS, SO THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD IF THERE IS  
15 SOMEONE WHO IS GOING TO OBJECT.

16 IN CONCEPT I WOULD SAY THAT THE PROPOSED  
17 SETTLEMENT -- THESE ARE MY TENTATIVE OBSERVATIONS, WITHOUT THE  
18 BENEFIT OF ANYONE HAVING AN OBJECTION. BUT IT APPEARS THAT  
19 GIVEN THE JOINT SUBMISSION THIS IS A VERY DETAILED, WELL  
20 THOUGHT OUT PROPOSAL THAT INVOLVES MANY, MANY STAKEHOLDERS.

21 AND FROM THE COURT'S READING OF THE PROPOSED  
22 SETTLEMENT IT APPEARS EXCELLENT. I AM VERY IMPRESSED WITH THE  
23 DETAIL OF THE POCKET AREAS THAT ARE COVERED DEPENDING ON THE  
24 PARTICULAR CIRCUMSTANCES THAT MIGHT BE PRESENT TO PARTICULAR  
25 PARENTS AND/OR CHILDREN. AND THEN PROVIDING FOR THE PROCESS

SEPTEMBER 14, 2018

Exhibit 15,

Page 18

1 THAT WOULD APPLY IN THOSE PARTICULAR CIRCUMSTANCES, WHETHER IT  
 2 IS A 235 OR A 240 HEARING, OR THOSE KINDS OF DETAILS. IT  
 3 SEEMS THAT NO STONE WAS LEFT UNTURNED.

4 AND THAT THE PROPOSAL EXEMPLIFIES GOOD FAITH ON  
 5 BEHALF OF ALL, AND PARTICULARLY THE GOVERNMENT, IN RECOGNIZING  
 6 THESE RIGHTS AND AFFORDING OF AN ORDERLY PROCESS AND  
 7 OPPORTUNITY FOR THESE CLASS MEMBERS IN MS. L. AND PUTATIVE  
 8 CLASS MEMBERS IN MMM, AS WELL AS THE DORA PLAINTIFFS, TO  
 9 PURSUE THESE AVENUES.

10 SO ABSENT HEARING FROM SOMEONE, EITHER NOW OR AT A  
 11 LATER TIME ON AN OBJECTION, WRITTEN OBJECTION, IT SEEMS TO ME  
 12 THAT THIS IS AN EXCELLENT PROPOSAL AND WE OUGHT TO MOVE  
 13 FORWARD AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE.

14 SO WHAT I WOULD PROPOSE IS THAT COUNSEL MEET AND  
 15 CONFER, AND THEN SUBMIT A JOINT MOTION AND ORDER ADDRESSING  
 16 THE CLASS CERTIFICATION AND PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE  
 17 SETTLEMENT, WITH THE OPPORTUNITY FOR ANYONE TO OBJECT. AND  
 18 THERE COULD BE A TIMELINE SET OUT FOR OBJECTIONS TO BE FILED  
 19 AND A TIME IN WHICH ANY OBJECTIONS MIGHT BE HEARD.

20 IN THAT REGARD ALSO, JUST LOOKING TO THE TIMELINE OF  
 21 ALL OF THIS. THE NINTH CIRCUIT HAS STAYED THE GOVERNMENT'S  
 22 APPEAL IN MS. L. TO NOVEMBER 9.

23 WHAT WOULD THE GOVERNMENT'S POSITION BE NOW? WOULD  
 24 YOU BE SEEKING TO CONTINUE THAT NOVEMBER 9 TIME FRAME AS WE  
 25 GET CLOSER TO THAT DATE?

SEPTEMBER 14, 2018

1                   **MR. STEWART:** YOUR HONOR, I DON'T THINK A DECISION  
2 IS MADE ON THAT. MY GUESS IS THAT WE WOULD SIMILARLY  
3 CONTINUE -- YOU KNOW, WE HAVE TO SEE WHAT THE SOLICITOR  
4 GENERAL MAY DECIDE ON THERE, BUT IT COULD VERY WELL BE THAT WE  
5 MIGHT SEEK, YOU KNOW, MORE TIME TO JUST MAKE SURE THERE IS NO  
6 DISRUPTION TO THE ONGOING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRELIMINARY  
7 INJUNCTION.

8                   OBVIOUSLY THAT IS A WAYS OUT, SO HOPEFULLY WE WILL  
9 HAVE A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF RESOLUTION BY THAT TIME, YOUR  
10 HONOR. BUT I DON'T THINK WE HAVE ANY SORT OF FURTHER DECISION  
11 FROM THE GOVERNMENT AS TO ITS PROCESSES OR WHERE THINGS STAND.

12                  **THE COURT:** OKAY. AND THEN WHAT ABOUT THE IDEA OF  
13 STARTING NOW. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE VAST MAJORITY OF MS. L.  
14 CLASS MEMBERS AND MMM CLASS MEMBERS, ONCE THE CLASS IS  
15 CERTIFIED, ARE GOING TO BE ONBOARD AND READY TO PROCEED. IS  
16 IT POSSIBLE TO START RIGHT AWAY?

17                  THE IDEA OF CLASS CERTIFICATION AND FINAL APPROVAL  
18 OF THE SETTLEMENT AND A NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY TO OBJECT  
19 REALLY, I THINK, WILL APPLY TO A VERY SMALL HANDFUL OF  
20 POTENTIAL CLASS MEMBERS, IF ANY. AND IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE  
21 PROCESS COULD GET UNDERWAY SOONER RATHER THAN LATER, AND NOT  
22 HAVE TO WAIT FOR FINAL APPROVAL.

23                  WHAT WOULD THE GOVERNMENT'S VIEW BE?

24                  **MR. STEWART:** YOUR HONOR, OUR TENTATIVE VIEW WOULD  
25 BE THAT I THINK THAT THAT IS APPROPRIATE AND WE COULD GET

SEPTEMBER 14, 2018

1 MOVING ON THIS.

2 I WOULD JUST SAY IF I DO COME -- IF IT DOES COME TO  
3 MY ATTENTION, YOU KNOW, AN IMPEDIMENT OR SORT OF A REASON  
4 OTHERWISE, MAY WE BRING THAT TO THE COURT'S ATTENTION IF WE  
5 REALIZE IT?

6 BUT MY HOPE IS WITH MOST -- YOU KNOW, AS WITH OTHER  
7 PLANS WE HAVE APPROVED IT CONSISTENT WITH OUR DESIRE TO MOVE  
8 THINGS EXPEDITIOUSLY BUT ORDERLY, WE WOULD WANT TO JUST GET  
9 MOVING. IF IT IS A GOOD PLAN, WE SHOULD GET MOVING.

10 **THE COURT:** MR. BERNICK, DO YOU AGREE?

11 **MR. BERNICK:** YOUR HONOR, THIS IS JUSTIN BERNICK FOR  
12 THE MMM PLAINTIFFS.

13 WE AGREE WITH THAT.

14 **THE COURT:** OKAY. SO ON THAT, I WOULD DECLINE TO  
15 MAKE ANY ORDERS BUT JUST INVITE THE PARTIES, ON A  
16 MEET-AND-CONFER BASIS, START THE PROCESS WITH THE IDEA THAT  
17 THE COURT, IN CONCEPT, APPROVES THE SETTLEMENT. OF COURSE,  
18 RESERVING FINAL DETERMINATION BASED ON ANY OBJECTION THAT  
19 MIGHT BE MADE, BUT IN CONCEPT THE PARTIES OUGHT TO GET MOVING.  
20 AND TO THE EXTENT YOU CAN IDENTIFY PLAINTIFFS -- CHILDREN AND  
21 PARENTS -- WHO WANT TO GET STARTED WITH THE VARIOUS  
22 PROCEEDINGS UNDER 235 OR 240, THAT WE OUGHT TO START THAT  
23 RIGHT AWAY. AND I WILL LEAVE IT TO THE PARTIES TO MEET AND  
24 CONFER AND IDENTIFY THOSE INDIVIDUALS, AND THEN GET THE  
25 PROCESS GOING.

SEPTEMBER 14, 2018

1                   WE WILL ALSO -- AS WE GO ALONG I WILL ASK THAT THIS  
2 PROCESS BE ROLLED INTO THE STATUS REPORT, SO THAT DURING THIS  
3 WEEKLY STATUS REPORT THE PARTIES CAN INCLUDE A STATUS ON THIS  
4 PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AND IDENTIFY THE PARENTS AND THE CHILDREN.  
5 AND GIVE A STATUS AS TO THE VARIOUS PROCEEDINGS UNDER 235,  
6 240, WHATEVER THEY MIGHT BE UNDER THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT, SO  
7 THAT THE COURT AND THE PUBLIC CAN KEEP TRACK OF THE PARTIES'  
8 EFFORTS AND PROGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THESE ASYLUM CLAIMS.

9                   ARE THERE ANY OTHER THOUGHTS ON THIS PROPOSED  
10 SETTLEMENT? OTHERWISE WE WILL MOVE TO THE JOINT STATUS  
11 REPORT.

12                   THE IDEA WOULD BE THAT ON THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT  
13 THE PARTIES WILL SUBMIT SOMETHING TO THE COURT BY NEXT  
14 THURSDAY, 3:00 P.M., OR SOONER, ON A JOINT MOTION AND ORDER  
15 FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT.

16                   ANYTHING ELSE?

17                   **MR. STEWART:** YOUR HONOR, I DO HAVE ONE QUESTION ON  
18 THIS.

19                   THE TRO ITSELF IS -- AS YOU KNOW, THE APPROVAL OF  
20 THE AGREEMENT WOULD -- WOULD, AS IT STANDS, LIFT THE TRO  
21 ITSELF. IS YOUR INTENTION IN GOING FORWARD WITH THE AGREEMENT  
22 THAT THE TRO WOULD BE LIFTED AS TO FOLKS THAT REACHED THE  
23 APPROPRIATE POINT IN THE PROCESS WHERE THEY CAN RETURN TO  
24 THEIR COUNTRY OF ORIGIN? OR HOW WOULD YOU SEE THE TRO AS  
25 BEING AFFECTED BY THIS -- BY THIS KIND OF A PRELIMINARY

SEPTEMBER 14, 2018

1 APPROVAL OR THE DIRECTIVE TO PROCEED UNDER THE PLAN?

2 **THE COURT:** I THINK, AS THE PARTIES PROPOSE, IT CAN  
3 BE LIFTED IN APPROPRIATE CASES. AND I THINK THE WAY WE  
4 DISCUSSED IT A HEARING OR TWO AGO IS THAT THE PARTIES COULD  
5 SIMPLY MEET AND CONFER AND IDENTIFY IN WRITING FOR CERTAIN  
6 NAMED INDIVIDUALS A LIFTING OF THE TRO SO THAT THOSE PERSONS  
7 COULD BE REUNIFIED IN THEIR HOME COUNTRY OR REMOVED, WHATEVER  
8 THE CASE MAY BE.

9 WOULDN'T THAT BE APPROPRIATE?

10 **MR. STEWART:** I THINK THAT'S -- I THINK, YOUR HONOR,  
11 THAT THAT MAY BE A WORKABLE APPROACH FOR THIS PRELIMINARY  
12 PIECE.

13 AM I UNDERSTANDING THAT YOUR HONOR IS SUGGESTING  
14 THAT THE PARTIES WOULD BE ABLE TO SAY, OKAY -- YOU KNOW, THEY  
15 WOULD COMMUNICATE AMONGST THEMSELVES IF THEY AGREE THAT  
16 SOMEBODY -- YOU KNOW, THAT TRO WAS LIFTED AS TO THAT PERSON  
17 THEY COULD THEN PROCEED WITH REPATRIATION OR WHATEVER THE  
18 APPROPRIATE PATH IS, OR WOULD YOU WANT THE INDIVIDUALS BROUGHT  
19 TO THE COURT IN THOSE CASES?

20 **THE COURT:** THE FORMER, SO THAT THE PARTIES SIMPLY  
21 WORK THROUGH IT AND IDENTIFY THOSE INDIVIDUALS, AND THEN ALLOW  
22 THEM TO BE REPATRIATED WITHOUT FURTHER COURT INVOLVEMENT.

23 DO YOU AGREE, MR. BERNICK?

24 **MR. BERNICK:** I DO, YOUR HONOR. I AM SPEAKING,  
25 AGAIN, FOR THE MMM PLAINTIFFS, AND I WILL LET THE MS. L. AND

SEPTEMBER 14, 2018

Exhibit 15,

Page 23

1 DORA PLAINTIFFS EXPLAIN IF THEY HAVE A DIFFERENT VIEW.

2 BUT FROM OUR PERSPECTIVE, ONCE A CHILD RECEIVES THE  
 3 PROCESS UNDER THIS AGREEMENT AND THEY HAVE NO OBJECTIONS TO  
 4 THE SETTLEMENT, THEN WE SHOULD MOVE FORWARD. AND IF THE  
 5 RESULT IS REMOVAL, THEN THE TRO SHOULD BE LIFTED AS TO THAT  
 6 INDIVIDUAL. THAT WOULD BE OUR POSITION.

7 **THE COURT:** OKAY.

8 MR. GELERTN, DO YOU AGREE?

9 **MR. GELERTN:** YES, YOUR HONOR.

10 **THE COURT:** AND, IS IT MS. SHEBAYA OR MR. BARMAYER,  
 11 DO YOU AGREE ON BEHALF OF THE DORA?

12 **MR. BARMAYER:** YES. THIS IS MR. BARMAYER, YOUR  
 13 HONOR. THANK YOU.

14 YES, WE AGREE AS WELL. AND WE WILL NEED TO MEET AND  
 15 CONFER WITH THE GOVERNMENT, AGREE ON MOVING THIS FORWARD AS  
 16 EXPEDITIOUSLY AS POSSIBLE AND GETTING THE PROCESS GOING.

17 ONE PART OF THE AGREEMENT IS TO ALLOW THE FAMILIES  
 18 TO HAVE COUNSEL IN THE PROCESS, AND SO -- AND WE DON'T -- WE  
 19 WILL NEED TO BE WORKING WITH THE STAKEHOLDERS TO SEE IF WE CAN  
 20 TRY TO COORDINATE THAT. AND SO WE WILL NEED TO SPEAK WITH THE  
 21 GOVERNMENT ABOUT HOW QUICKLY WE CAN MOVE FORWARD WITH THE  
 22 PROCESS.

23 **THE COURT:** OKAY. VERY GOOD.

24 THEN JUST A QUESTION ON THE GENERAL TIMELINE. DO  
 25 COUNSEL HAVE AN IDEA OF HOW LONG THIS PROCESS IS GOING TO

SEPTEMBER 14, 2018

1 TAKE? SO LET'S ASSUME BEST CASE SCENARIO, EVERYTHING GOES  
2 SMOOTHLY. WE GET STARTED RIGHT NOW. 235, 240 HEARINGS AND  
3 ALL OF THE THINGS THAT ARE CONTEMPLATED IN THE PROPOSED  
4 SETTLEMENT ARE MOVING EFFICIENTLY AND FROM THE EARLIEST  
5 POSSIBLE DATE; WHAT DOES THIS TIMELINE LOOK LIKE? DOES ANYONE  
6 KNOW?

7 I ASSUME THERE IS GOING TO BE DIFFERENT TIME FRAMES  
8 DEPENDING ON THE TYPE OF HEARING THAT IS INVOLVED.

9 **MR. STEWART:** I THINK THAT IS RIGHT, YOUR HONOR.  
10 SOME FOLKS IN SOME AREAS WILL BE QUITE EXPEDITIOUS, OTHER  
11 FOLKS WHO, FOR EXAMPLE, MAY BE GOING TO 240 PROCEEDINGS WILL  
12 TAKE A BIT OF A LONGER COURSE, YOU KNOW, WOULD BE THE  
13 EXPECTATION.

14 WHAT I CAN SAY IS IF THE GOVERNMENT IS LOOKING TO  
15 MAKE SURE THAT, YOU KNOW, WHEREVER IT CAN, YOU KNOW, MAKE SURE  
16 THAT THINGS MOVE SWIFTLY, IT WANTS TO KEEP AN EYE ON THAT AND  
17 MAKE SURE THAT EVERYTHING IS MOVING AS, YOU KNOW,  
18 EXPEDITIOUSLY AS THEY CAN.

19 IF I CAN GET MORE CLARITY ON TIMING I CAN DO SO,  
20 YOUR HONOR.

21 **THE COURT:** I THINK IT IS FAIR TO SAY THAT WITH SOME  
22 IT MAY JUST BE A MATTER OF WEEKS, WITH OTHERS, PARTICULARLY  
23 WITH 240 HEARINGS, IT MAY BE MONTHS?

24 **MR. STEWART:** I THINK SO, YOUR HONOR, YES. THAT  
25 SOUNDS RIGHT.

SEPTEMBER 14, 2018

## EXHIBIT 16

**Best, Zachary W.**

---

**From:** Stewart, Scott G. (CIV) <Scott.G.Stewart@usdoj.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 20, 2018 12:58 PM  
**To:** Bernick, Justin W.; Lee Gelernt; Best, Zachary W.; Anand Balakrishnan; Fleming, John Weymouth, T. Clark; Stephen Kang; Spencer Amdur; Daniel Galindo; Judy Rabinovitz; Simon Sandoval-Moshenberg; Barmeyer, Wilson; Sirine Shebaya; Levy, Jennifer; Flentje, August (CIV); Robins, Jeffrey (CIV); Fabian, Sarah B (CIV)  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** MMM/Ms. L follow-up

Counsel:

The government is undertaking to implement the parties' agreement in accordance with the court's tentative approval at the last status conference. Could you please let us know as soon as possible how you plan to implement the waiver provision in paragraph 8 of the agreement on your end? (Paragraph 8 provides that "Ms. L counsel, M.M.M. counsel, or Dora counsel may identify class members who wish to waive the procedures described herein and be promptly removed to their country of origin," and it provides that plaintiffs' counsel "will promptly develop a process for obtaining and documenting such a choice through a knowing and voluntary waiver.") As the government identifies individuals to be processed under the different provisions of the agreement, and starts to move those processes forward, it is important that we know ASAP both: (a) which parents and children do not want to move forward under the agreement—and instead wish to waive those rights and return to their COO—so that we do not inadvertently put them in a process that would slow down their desire to return to their COO; and (b) which parents and children wish to pursue the processes set forth in the agreement, so that there is likewise no unneeded delay in enabling those class members to move forward. Can you please confirm that such a process is being developed, and let us know when we can expect that you will be able to confirm (perhaps on a rolling basis) whether individual class members wish either to waive their rights or to proceed under the agreement?

Thank you.

1 MICHAEL M. MADDIGAN (SBN 163450)  
2 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
3 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
4 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
5 Telephone: (310) 785-4727  
6 Facsimile: (310) 785-4601  
7 Email: michael.maddigan@hoganlovells.com

8  
9  
10 Attorney for *M.M.M.* Plaintiffs  
11  
12

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**SAN DIEGO DIVISION**

M.M.M., on behalf of his minor child,  
J.M.A., et al.,

Case No. 3:18-cv-1832-DMS  
Honorable Dana M. Sabraw

Plaintiffs,

v.

Jefferson Beauregard Sessions, III,  
Attorney General of the United States,  
et al.,

Defendants.

Ms. L, et al.,

Case No. 3:18-cv-428-DMS  
Honorable Dana M. Sabraw

Plaintiff,

v.

U.S. Immigration and Customs  
Enforcement, et al.,

**[PROPOSED] ORDER  
GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'  
EMERGENCY MOTION TO  
REQUIRE IMPLEMENTATION  
OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

Defendant.

Upon consideration of Plaintiffs' Emergency Motion to Require Implementation of Settlement Agreement, it is hereby ORDERED that Defendants implement the terms of the parties' settlement agreement immediately, prior to final approval, for class members who execute the notice and waiver form approved by the Court.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

The Hon. Judge Dana Sabraw